

## REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application. Claims 1-6, 9-18, and 20 are currently pending. Claims 1-4 and 9-13 have been amended. Claims 7, 8, and 19 have been canceled, without prejudice. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because the term “bayonet shaped” is unclear to the Examiner. Claim 12 has been amended to replace the term “bayonet shaped” with “bayonet connector,” which is a well known term in the art. For example, the definition of “bayonet connector” at Wikipedia (see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bayonet\\_mount](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bayonet_mount)) demonstrates the widespread acceptance of the term “bayonet connector.” Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the indefiniteness rejection be withdrawn.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by German Patent Document DE 198 08 696 to Sommer et al. (“Sommer”). Claim 7 has been canceled, without prejudice. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 1. The Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 1 for at least the following two reasons.

*First*, Sommer does not disclose a “guide rail having a first end and a second end opposed from one another in the movement direction of the door” and “a first insert body configured and dimensioned to be interchangeably plugged into the first end of the guide rail and the second end of the guide rail,” as recited by claim 1. The Office Action aligns the cover rails 4, 5 of Sommer with the claimed “guide rail,” and aligns the cover 40 of Sommer with the claimed “first insert body.” The Office Action asserts that the cover 40 is usable on the end of either the cover rail 4 or the cover rail 5. However, the end of the cover rail 4 and the end of the cover rail 5 are not “a first end and a second end [of a guide rail] opposed from one another in the movement direction of the door,” as claimed. Rather, the end of the cover rail 4 and the end of the cover rail 5 are the ends of two different rails, and are opposed in a direction *transverse to* the movement direction of the door. Therefore, Sommer does not disclose a “guide rail having a first end and a second end opposed from one another in the movement direction of the door” and “a first insert body configured and dimensioned to be interchangeably plugged into the first end of the guide rail and the second end of the guide rail,” as recited by claim 1.

*Second*, Sommer does not disclose a “first traction mechanism tensioning device including a positive interlocking part adapted to lock the traction mechanism to the first insert body without tools, and to release the traction mechanism from the first insert body without tools,” as recited by claim 1. The Office Action aligns Sommer’s screw mounting 41 with the claimed “first traction mechanism tensioning device,” and aligns Sommer’s chain 35 with the claimed “traction mechanism.” The Office Action also aligns Sommer’s cover 40 with the claimed “first insert body.” However, the screw mounting 41 does not include a positive

interlocking part adapted to lock the chain 35 to the cover 40 without tools, and to release the chain 35 from the cover 40 without tools, as claimed. Rather, tools, such as wrenches, are required to lock the chain 35 to the cover, and to release the chain 35 from the cover, for example, to unscrew the screw mounting 41 from the cover 40. Therefore, Sommer does not disclose a “first traction mechanism tensioning device including a positive interlocking part adapted to lock the traction mechanism to the first insert body without tools, and to release the traction mechanism from the first insert body without tools,” as recited by claim 1.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1, and is patentable over Sommer for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

(1) The Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Swiss Patent Document CH 678964 to Kaiser et al. (“Kaiser”) in view of Sommer. Claim 7 has been canceled, without prejudice. Claim 1 is the independent claim. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

No reasonable combination of Kaiser and Sommer discloses or renders obvious a “first traction mechanism tensioning device including a positive interlocking part adapted to lock the traction mechanism to the first insert body without tools, and to release the traction mechanism from the first insert body without tools,” as recited by claim 1. The Office Action aligns Kaiser’s screw mounting 13 with the claimed “first traction mechanism tensioning device,” and aligns Kaiser’s tensional chain 12 with the claimed “traction mechanism.” The Office Action

also aligns Kaiser's end piece 16 with the claimed "first insert body." However, the screw mounting 13 does not include a positive interlocking part adapted to lock the tensional chain 12 to the end piece 16 without tools, and to release the tensional chain 12 from the end piece 16 without tools, as claimed. Rather, like Sommer, tools are required to lock the tensional chain 12 to the end piece 16, and to release the tensional chain 12 from the end piece, for example, to unscrew the screw mounting 13 from the end piece 16. Sommer does not remedy the deficiencies of Kaiser, as demonstrated above with respect to the rejection under Section 102. As a result, no reasonable combination of Kaiser and Sommer discloses or renders obvious a "first traction mechanism tensioning device including a positive interlocking part adapted to lock the traction mechanism to the first insert body without tools, and to release the traction mechanism from the first insert body without tools," as recited by claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 9-11, 14-18, and 20 depend variously from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

(2) The Office Action rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sommer in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,981,026 to Blodgett ("Blodgett"). Claim 13 depends from claim 1. As demonstrated above in connection with the Section 102 rejection, claim 1 is patentable over Sommer. Blodgett does not remedy the deficiencies of Sommer. Particularly, Blodgett does not disclose that "the positive interlocking part delivers current from the current source to the first traction mechanism," as claimed, because Blodgett's chain bolts 10 do not deliver current from a current source to the sprocket chain 9. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 1, and its dependent claim 13, are patentable over any reasonable combination

Applicant: Frank-Uwe Sommer  
Appl. No.: 10/518,360

of Sommer and Blodgett.

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 26, 2008

/Steven J. Schwarz/  
Steven J. Schwarz  
Registration No. 47,070  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

#999518